

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PRELIMINARY AGENDA: Friday, June 21, 2013

- 8:45 a.m.**
- **Call to order; determine quorum**
 - **Approval of Minutes**
 - **Unscheduled citizens:** A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or ask questions of the Commission or Planning Staff about items which are not scheduled on the day's agenda.

9:00 a.m. **Leave for Cross Bar Ranch**, site visit/no action, request for a 12,500 square foot single-family residence, in excess of the thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: D.2 Maximum Building Size and Maximum Aggregate of All Structures*. The property is located east of the City of Gunnison and north of Sargents on County Road 888 (Whitepine) and is legally described as the S1/2E1/2NE1/4, Section 4 and the N1/2N1/2S1/2SE1/4, Section 9, Township 48 North, Range 5 East, and portions of Section 8, 16, 17, 20, 21, 27, 28 and 33, Township 49 North, Range 5 East, N.M.P.M., 3535 County Road 888

11:30 a.m. **Cross Bar Ranch**, public hearing/possible action, request for a 12,500 square foot single-family residence, in excess of the thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: D.2 Maximum Building Size and Maximum Aggregate of All Structures*.

Lunch

1:30p.m. **Scarp Ridge, LLC**, work session/no action, presentation of Sketch Plan application. The applicant is requesting approval for a master plan for the Scarp Ridge LLC (aka Irwin) property to include use of the existing lodge for weddings and events and as a conference center; six new single-family residences on adjoining mining claims; one storage structure, one elevated overlook structure, two alpine huts; expansion of the existing maintenance barn; the addition of a roof deck to the existing parking barn; outdoor pavilion that would seat approximately 170 people; new mountain bike trails; zipline; kids' village to include playground equipment; reroute of the existing Scarp Ridge trail. The proposed structures and facilities will comprise a year-round commercial resort. The property is located 12 miles west of the Town of Crested Butte, accessed from Kebler Pass Road (CR 12), Lake Irwin Campground Road (FSR 826), Green Lake Road (FSR 826.1E) and Irwin Lodge Road (FSR 826.1C). The parcel is legally described as the following 19 lode mining claims, all in the Ruby Mining District: Aumego, U.S. Survey No. 2703; Capitol U.S. Survey No. 3466; Clara U.S. Survey No. 2801; Fourth of July U.S. Survey No. 3467; Zumo U.S. Survey No. 2702; Crystal, U.S. Survey No. 1156; Diquita, U.S. Survey No. 2786; Double Dyke U.S. Survey No. 5511; Lead Chief U.S. Survey No. 2731; Legal U.S. Survey No. 4149; Silver Hill U.S. Survey No. 2813; Justice U.S. Survey No. 2867; Pickwick, U.S. Survey No. 2814; Tacoma U.S. Survey No. 2701; Lottie S U.S. Survey No. 5322; US Treasury, U.S. Survey No. 5322; Lower Chloride, U.S. Survey No. 17240A; Little Minnie, U.S. Survey No. 4421; Staten Island, U.S. Survey No. 3716.

2:30 p.m. **Gunnison Valley Properties, LLC**, site visit/no action, Preliminary/Final Plan; request for a year-round sand and gravel operation on 109-acres of a 220-acre parcel; 62-acres of which will be excavated. The operation will include the extraction, crushing, screening, washing and stockpiling of approximately 200,000 tons of sand and gravel per year. Asphalt and concrete batching is also proposed to be conducted at the facility. The property is located approximately ½ mile east of the City of Gunnison, south of Highway 50 to Tomichi Creek, legally described as a being located in the NE/4 SE/4 NW/4 Section 4 and the NE/4NE/4 Section 5, Township 49 North, Range 1 East, N.M.P.M., 43188 Highway 50

3:30 p.m. **Gunnison Valley Properties, LLC**, work session/no action, Preliminary/Final Plan; request for a year-round sand and gravel operation on 109-acres of a 220-acre parcel; 62-acres of which will be excavated. The operation will include the extraction, crushing, screening, washing and stockpiling of approximately 200,000 tons of sand and gravel per year. Asphalt and concrete batching is also proposed to be conducted at the facility.

- End of Meeting**
- Report of actions taken by BOCC.
 - A brief period in which Commission debriefs on the day's processes, etc. No discussion or action on any specific Land Use Change Permit applications will take place at this time.

Adjourn

**GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 21, 2013

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting, in the Commissioners' Meeting Room in the Blackstocks Government Center, Planning Commission meeting room. **Present were:**

Chairman- Kent Fulton	Assistant Director of Community Development- Neal Starkebaum
Vice-Chairman- Jim Seitz	Planner-Cathie Pagano
Commissioner- Warren Wilcox	Community Development Department Services Manager-Beth Baker
Commissioner-Susan Eskew	
Alternate Commissioner- Jeremy Rubingh	
Alternate Commissioner- Tom Venard	

Absent- Commissioner A.J. Cattles

Others present as listed in text

With a quorum present Chairman Kent Fulton opened the regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Moved by: Seitz seconded by Wilcox to approve Planning Commission minutes dated June 7, 2013 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Cross Bar Ranch: Site visit/no action, request for a 12,500 square foot single-family residence, in excess of the thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: D.2 Maximum Building Size and Maximum Aggregate of All Structures*. The property is located east of the City of Gunnison and north of Sargents on County Road 888 (Whitepine) and is legally described as the S1/2E1/2NE1/4, Section 4 and the N1/2N1/2S1/2SE1/4, Section 9, Township 48 North, Range 5 East, and portions of Section 8, 16, 17, 20, 21, 27, 28 and 33, Township 49 North, Range 5 East, N.M.P.M., 3535 County Road 888.

No minutes were taken at the site visit.

Cross Bar Ranch: Public hearing/possible action, request for a 12,500 square foot single-family residence, in excess of the thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: D.2 Maximum Building Size and Maximum Aggregate of All Structures*.

Chairman Kent Fulton recused himself.

With a quorum present Vice Chairman Jim Seitz opened the public hearing.

No members of the public were present.

Community Development Services Manager Beth Baker confirmed adequate public notice. The applicant submitted the certified mailing receipts and photo of the site posted. The Planning office published the public notice in the CB News and Gunnison Country Times.

Applicant's representative Jennifer Barvitski was present for the discussion.

Barvitski explained the applicant is requesting an addition to his existing 3,335 sq. ft. residence. The residence would be approximately 12,000 sq. ft. This will result in excess of the thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: D.2 Maximum Building Size and Maximum Aggregate of All Structures*.

No comments from Staff

County Wildlife Coordinator Jim Cochran explained the actual location of project is not in Sage grouse habitat. County Public Works conducted a site visit and determined that driveway work would be required. The project now does have a Sage grouse component because of the location of the driveway. He clarified the house is not in Sage grouse habitat but the driveway is. Cochran has reexamined the circumstances and has determined there is no impact to the Sage grouse habitat. He stated Gunnison County strictly follows the Sage Grouse regulations. He said there is not an impact to the interface between the sage brush and the meadow. There is no impact to the timber interface on the other side.

Planner Cathie Pagano asked about the comments submitted to the Commission by Cochran. He agreed to clarify his written comments. He will submit updated remarks for the planning file.

Seitz was concerned with the possibility of wildfires and the location of the structures. He requested the Commission's decision include a reference to wildfires in the findings. Barvitski explained there will be large water storage tanks on site, for water suppression. The structures will not be sprinkled.

Commissioner's Site Visit Comments;

Eskew- This will be a nice fit for the area. It is a large structure and could be considered obtrusive, but with 40 % of the structure below ground, it is well mitigated.

Venard –Agreed with Eskew's comments

Wilcox- It is a good site that was adequately planned and thought through. The potential wildfire issue is personal. A defensible perimeter is wise.

Rubingh- Agreed with Wilcox's comments- The site did seem close to the trees- and they should consider wildfire mitigation.

Seitz- Agreed with Rubingh's comments - The open meadow makes the fighting of a fire less difficult. He had no objections to the location.

The Commission reviewed the draft decision of approval.

Commissioners Rubingh and Venard were seated for the vote.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Crossbar Ranch, LLC represented by Jennifer Barvitski is requesting a 9,165 square foot addition to the existing 3,335 square foot primary residence and 1,000 square foot detached secondary residences, in excess of the maximum thresholds identified in *Section 13-105: Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages*. The applicant also may construct a 2,350 square foot detached garage in the future; however, the garage and any other proposed or existing accessory structures are not subject to the aggregate size thresholds of *Section 13-105* because the subject parcel is an agricultural operation. *Section 13-105: B.2. Residences Associated with Agricultural, Commercial, or Industrial Operations*, states:

Residences associated with agricultural, commercial or industrial operations shall be subject to maximum structure size requirements of this Section. However, the size of accessory structures, the aggregate size of residences and accessory structures, the constraints on coverage and on building envelopes shall not apply to agricultural, commercial or industrial operations.

The proposed addition to existing residence will make the residence approximately 12,500 square feet. The applicant states that approximately 3,500 square feet of the proposed addition will be located at least partially, if not fully, below ground. The above ground square footage will not exceed 10,000 square feet.

The subject parcel is located east of the City of Gunnison, north of Sargents on County Road 888 (Whitepine) at 3535 County Road 888. The parcel is legally described as the S1/2E1/2NE1/4, Section 4 and the N1/2N1/2S1/2SE1/4, Section 9, Township 48 North, Range 5 East, and portions of Section 8, 16, 17, 20, 21, 27, 28 and 33, Township 49 North, Range 5 East, N.M.P.M.

IMPACT CLASSIFICATION:

The project, by definition, is a minor impact pursuant to *Section 6-102: C. Primary Residence 10,000 sq. ft. or Larger (amended)*.

MEETING DATES:

The Planning Commission held work sessions and public hearings to discuss the Bear Ranch application on the following dates:

- June 7, 2013 Work session
- June 21, 2013 Site Visit and Public Hearing

SITE VISIT:

The Planning Commission conducted a site visit for this application on June 21, 2013. The Commission noted that the siting was appropriate and the aesthetic character of the proposed addition was pleasing. They also noted that residence seemed a bit close to the existing trees on the parcel. The Commission said that the structure did not appear obtrusively visible.

PUBLIC HEARING:

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on June 21, 2013. No public comments were received.

REVIEW AGENCY REFERRAL COMMENTS:

A copy of the complete application was sent via electronic mail to the following agencies: Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Gunnison County Public Works, and the Gunnison County Wildlife Coordinator, Gunnison County Fire Protection District. Comments from the agencies and are noted in the applicable sections below.

COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE GUNNISON COUNTY LAND USE RESOLUTION:

Section 9-100: *Uses Secondary to a Primary Residence.*

Not applicable. No secondary uses are proposed as part of this application.

Section 9-200: *Special Residential Uses.*

Not applicable. No special residential uses are proposed as part of this application.

Section 9-300: *Commercial and Industrial Uses.*

Not applicable, no commercial industrial use is proposed as part of this application.

Section 9-400: *Exploration, Extraction and Processing of Minerals and Construction Materials.*

Not applicable. No exploration, extraction or processing of materials is proposed.

Section 9-500: *Miscellaneous Uses and Activities.*

Not applicable. No miscellaneous uses or activities are proposed.

Section 10-102: *Locational Standards for Residential Development.*

Not applicable, no residential development (subdivision or multi-family development) is proposed as part of this application.

Section 10-103: *Residential Density.*

Not applicable, no residential development (subdivision or multi-family development) is proposed as part of this application.

Section 11-103: *Development In Areas Subject to Flood Hazards.*

Not applicable, the subject parcel is not in the 100-year floodplain.

Section 11-104: *Development in Areas Subject to Geologic Hazards.*

Not applicable, the subject parcel is not within a mapped geologic hazard area.

Section 11-105: *Development In Areas Subject to Wildfire Hazards.*

Applicable, portions of the subject parcel are in high wildfire hazard area. The owner shall be required to sign and have notarized an acknowledgment and disclaimer document as part of the building permit review.

Section 11-106: *Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas.*

The application was referred to Colorado Parks and Wildlife and the Gunnison County Wildlife Coordinator. An email, dated June 4, 2013, from Nick Gallowich, District Wildlife Manager – Gunnison East, noted that “we have concluded that the addition onto the present residence will not create any new significant impacts to the wildlife resource beyond the development impacts that have already occurred.”

Jim Cochran, Gunnison County Wildlife Coordinator, submitted comments in a letter dated June 11, 2013. *[There are some discrepancies in the comments and I am awaiting revised comments]*

Section 11-107: Protection of Water Quality.

Not applicable, there are no water bodies within 125 feet of the proposed development.

Section 11-108: Standards For Development On Ridgelines.

Not applicable. The site is not located on a ridgeline.

Section 11-109: Development That Affects Agricultural Lands.

Not applicable, the subject parcel will not directly affect agricultural lands.

Section 11-110: Development Of Land Beyond Snowplowed Access.

Not applicable, the site is not located beyond snowplowed access.

Section 11-111: Development On Inholdings In The National Wilderness.

Not applicable, the site is not located on a National Wilderness inholding.

Section 11-112: Development On Property Above Timberline.

Not applicable, the site is not located above timberline.

Section 12-103: Road System.

Applicable, a copy of the application was referred to Gunnison County Public Works. Allen Moores, Assistant Director, indicated that some minor improvements to the existing driveway are required. *[I am awaiting final comments from Public Works]*

Section 12-104: Public Trails.

There is no public trail existing or proposed on this site.

Section 12-105: Water Supply.

There is an existing well that is proposed to serve the addition to the residence. Well permit No. 234114 has been issued to serve not more than three single family dwellings, the irrigation of not more than one acre of home gardens and lawns, and the watering of domestic animals.

Section 12-106: Sewage Disposal/Wastewater Treatment.

Applicable, the existing residence is served by an individual sewage disposal system. The proposed addition may require an alteration permit to the existing system.

Section 12-107: Fire Protection.

The proposed development is located within the Gunnison Fire Protection District. The application was referred to the Gunnison Fire Protection District and no comments were received.

Section 13-103: General Site Plan Standards And Lot Measurements.

The site plan for this proposed development must meet the site plan criteria of this section, including proposed and existing roads, driveways, lot lines, building sites, and natural features of the site. The site plan, “Alvarez Main Residence,” prepared by Jennifer M. Barvitski, Architect, LLC and dated April 26, 2013, meets these criteria.

Section 13-104: Setbacks from Property Lines and Road Rights-of-Way.

This section applies; the proposed improvements meet the setback requirements.

Section 13-105: Residential Building Sizes and Lot Coverages.

Applicable, the proposed single family residence square footage of 12,500 square feet exceeds the maximum threshold allowed without a Land Use Change permit.

G.1. Finding of No Obtrusive Visibility Required for Approval

G.1.a. Minimize Visibility of Structure by Siting

The application notes that design of the addition would be built into the topography of the existing hillside. The existing home and proposed addition are set back approximately three-quarters of a mile from County Road 888. Approximately 1,750 square feet of the addition is proposed below grade; and, approximately 1,750 square feet of the addition is proposed to be partially below grade.

G.1.b. Minimize Visibility of Structure by Screening

On the south side of the addition is an existing large ridge covered with a dense evergreen and pine forest. This blocks the view of the existing residence and proposed addition completely from the south and southeast. On the north side of the addition is a large grove of evergreens and pines, which blocks the view of the existing home and the proposed addition almost completely from the north and northeast. The west side is not visible from any roads. The residence is not visible from any other parcel.

Grading and the addition of soils on the east side of the residence will create topography that is more gradual and will also hide parts of the addition located below grade. The applicant also proposes to use architectural techniques to make the home less obtrusive. Exterior materials will blend with the surrounding site and will consist of barn wood siding, log siding, stone, reclaimed log and square timbers, wood shake shingle roofs and rusted metal roofs.

G.1.c. Location of Utilities Underground

All utilities to the residence will be buried underground.

G.2. Obtrusive Visibility Shall Cause Denial

The structure is not obtrusively visible from outside of the subject parcel.

Section 13-106: Energy and Resource Conservation.

Applicable, this section will be applied at the time of building permit application.

Section 13-107: Installation of Solid Fuel-Burning Devices

This section applies and any solid fuel-burning devices proposed shall comply with this section.

Section 13-108: Open Space And Recreation Areas

Not applicable, no requirement of open space is required for this application.

Section 13-109: Signs.

There are no signs proposed as part of the submitted application.

Section 13-110: Off-Road Parking And Loading.

The number of parking spaces complies with **Appendix Table 3 and this section.**

Section 13-111: Landscaping And Buffering.

A landscaping plan is required and has been submitted as part of the site plan. The applicants propose that landscape planting areas be seeded with native grasses.

Section 13-112: Snow storage.

Design elements have been included within the site layout design allowing for adequate snow storage.

Section 13-113: Fencing

Applicable, this section applies and any fencing proposed shall comply with this section.

Section 13-114: Exterior Lighting.

Applicable, this section applies and any exterior lighting proposed shall comply with this section.

Section 13-115: Reclamation And Noxious Weed Control.

A reclamation permit is required for road cutting and/or construction, homesite clearing and berm construction.

Section 13-116: Grading And Erosion Control.

Grading activities are required to secure a Reclamation Permit from the Public Works Department, pursuant to Section 13-115: *Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control.*

Section 13-117: Drainage, Construction And Post-Construction Stormwater Runoff.

Not applicable.

Section 13-118: Water Impoundments.

Not applicable, this project does not propose a water impoundment.

Section 13-119: Standards to Ensure Compatible Uses.

The proposed development has been designed in a manner that will not adversely affect the character and tranquility of nearby residential or public use areas.

Article 15: Right-to-Ranch Policy.

This section is not applicable; there are no agricultural lands that will be affected by the uses on the subject parcel.

FINDINGS:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission finds that:

1. This project is classified as a Minor Impact.
2. The visibility of the single-family residence has been minimized by siting and utilization of existing topography to the shield the building.
3. The visibility of the single-family residence has been minimized through the use of natural colors and non-reflective building materials.
4. The proposed single-family residence will not be obtrusively visible from County Road 888 or any of the adjoining parcels.
5. Portions of the subject parcel are in high wildfire hazard area.
6. All utilities to the proposed single-family residence will be buried.
7. This application is consistent with the standards and requirements of this *Resolution*.
8. This review and decision incorporates, but is not limited to, all the documentation submitted to the County and included within the Community Development file relative to this application; including all exhibits, references and documents as included therein.

DECISION:

The Gunnison County Planning Commission, having considered the submitted plan, site observations and public testimony, has reached the above Findings and recommends that LUC-13-00007 be classified as a Minor Impact, and be approved with the following conditions:

1. The existing topography and vegetation shall be maintained in such a way that the single family residence remains unobtrusively visible.
2. All utilities to the single family residence shall be buried underground.
3. Non-reflective building materials and natural colors that are similar to the tones of the existing landscape at the site shall be used in design and construction of the single family residence.
4. The total square footage of the single family residence shall not exceed 12,500 square feet, as measured by the Gunnison County Building Office.
5. The owner shall be required to sign and have notarized an acknowledgment and disclaimer document as part of the building permit review.
6. This permit is limited to activities described within the "Project Description" of this application, and as depicted on the Plan submitted as part of this application. Expansion or change of this use will require either an application for amendment of this permit, or submittal of an application for a new permit, in compliance with applicable requirements of the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution*.
7. This approval is founded on each individual requirement. Should the applicant successfully challenge any such finding or requirement, this approval is null and void.

8. This permit may be revoked or suspended if Gunnison County determines that any material fact set forth herein or represented by the applicant was false or misleading, or that the applicant failed to disclose facts necessary to make any such fact not misleading.
9. The removal or material alteration of any physical feature of the property (geological, topographical or vegetative) relied on herein to mitigate a possible conflict shall require a new or amended land use change permit.
10. Approval of this use is based upon the facts presented and implies no approval of similar use in the same or different location and/or with different impacts on the environment and community. Any such future application shall be reviewed and evaluated, subject to its compliance with current regulations, and its impact to the County.

Scarp Ridge, LLC; Work session/no action, presentation of Sketch Plan application. The applicant is requesting approval for a master plan for the Scarp Ridge LLC (aka Irwin) property to include use of the existing lodge for weddings and events and as a conference center; six new single-family residences on adjoining mining claims; one storage structure, one elevated overlook structure, two alpine huts; expansion of the existing maintenance barn; the addition of a roof deck to the existing parking barn; outdoor pavilion that would seat approximately 170 people; new mountain bike trails; zipline; kids' village to include playground equipment; reroute of the existing Scarp Ridge trail. The proposed structures and facilities will comprise a year-round commercial resort. The property is located 12 miles west of the Town of Crested Butte, accessed from Kebler Pass Road (CR 12), Lake Irwin Campground Road (FSR 826), Green Lake Road (FSR 826.1E) and Irwin Lodge Road (FSR 826.1C). The parcel is legally described as the following 19 lode mining claims, all in the Ruby Mining District: Aumego, U.S. Survey No. 2703; Capitol U.S. Survey No. 3466; Clara U.S. Survey No. 2801; Fourth of July U.S. Survey No. 3467; Zumo U.S. Survey No. 2702; Crystal, U.S. Survey No. 1156; Diquita, U.S. Survey No. 2786; Double Dyke U.S. Survey No. 5511; Lead Chief U.S. Survey No. 2731; Legal U.S. Survey No. 4149; Silver Hill U.S. Survey No. 2813; Justice U.S. Survey No. 2867; Pickwick, U.S. Survey No. 2814; Tacoma U.S. Survey No. 2701; Lottie S U.S. Survey No. 5322; US Treasury, U.S. Survey No. 5322; Lower Chloride, U.S. Survey No. 17240A; Little Minnie, U.S. Survey No. 4421; Staten Island, U.S. Survey No. 3716.

Commissioner Rubingh recused himself.

With a quorum present Chairman Kent Fulton opened the work session.

Applicant's representatives John Featherman, attorney David Leinsdorf, engineer Norman Whitehead, and water engineer Tyler Martineau were present for the work session.

Leinsdorf said there were several changes to the narrative submitted to the Commission.

Featherman explained the project. The existing structures are on 145 acres. The fuel depot, parking garage, lodge, wastewater plant, maintenance shop, and movie cabin, are on the site. The lodge will be used as an assembly hall. The lodge will have two bathrooms, and a catering kitchen. Additional bathrooms, if needed, will be port o potties brought to the site. The lodge will be expanded; to include a lakeside deck and dormers at lakeside. They anticipate a maximum of 170 people for musical events. There will be six single family residences which will be available for rent. There will be a storage cabin, an overlook cabin, a hut and a high altitude hut. They will modify the parking barn to accommodate day use guests. There will be two bike trails, a kid's village, and zip lines for guests. The resort will be used year round. To mitigate trespass issues they will be relocating the Scrap Ridge trail head. The expansion of the resort will be done incrementally over 10 years, at a rate that compliments the product.

Planner Cathie Pagano explained referral agency comments are due next week.

Setiz asked about water and waste water; how does it fit into the Crested Butte watershed policies. Martineau said they have not coordinated with the Town of Crested Butte yet. There is an approved waste water system; it is a miniature treatment plant; better than just a septic system. They have a State approved treatment plant at the lodge; it is sized appropriately. Leinsdorf stated they will strictly comply with the Crested Butte Watershed regulations.

Eskew asked about the septic; engineer Whitehead explained it is basically a refined grey water system. Septic moves through a filter process. They will be using the Advantech system. The Commission requested information on that type of system.

Venard asked where the affluent was being released; Whitehead said a leach field. Leinsdorf stated the final design will be state of the art.

Eskew explained for the record she works at the hostile but she has no direct relationship with the Irwin group.

Leinsdorf said winter transportation is over the snow, there will be no plowing. Scarp Ridge will build a new trail to Forest Service standards.

Fulton questioned two restrooms for 170 people; Featherman said they will bring up port o potties on trailers when needed.

Featherman explained the residential occupancy will be 12 to 15. The six homes represent a plan for the future. They will expand with the demand for the skiing in the area. This plan will provide flexibility for the future.

Pagano noted the *Gunnison County Land Use Resolution (LUR)* states activities have to be identified; what they are and when they will occur. A land use change approval would then be vested for three years with a possibility of extension for one additional year. The improvements would have to be completed at that time. If the improvements were not completed the applicants would be required to reapply.

Fulton noted previously there had been a boat house in the proposal; Featherman said there is a structure they would like to put boats in.

Featherman explained the elevated overlook is a destination cabin on private property; there will be no overnight stays, in that cabin. The applicants are attempting to round out the offered activities. The alpine hut will be used similarly to the movie cabin. The winter use will be accommodated by two cats that would hold 12 individuals in each one. The alpine hut will be used for winter activities. The high alpine hut is meant to provide an additional event or destination. There are no designs for these huts yet. The high alpine hut will have no facilities. The lower alpine hut will have a septic facility. There are no roads to the high alpine hut; it will be a very rudimentary structure.

Fulton asked how many wells there will be; Martineau projected four to six wells. There is currently one well. They will be located as close in proximity to the structures as possible. The existing well is located near the lodge. Drilling the new wells will be very expensive. They are considering pipelines rather than wells.

Venard asked how deep the current well is; Martineau said 500 ft.

Fulton asked about the road system; Featherman explained the existing historic mining roads will be expanded to two track roads.

Seitz asked if public works would be involved with the roads. Whitehead said a waiver from the required 16 ft. road could be requested. They are considering building the road wide enough to accommodate a fire truck, and then letting it grow in, but it would still be travelable.

Fulton asked if the adjacent owners had been contacted; Featherman said they had contacted the adjacent neighbors, resulting in a few positive responses and a few negative responses. There is a property owners meeting scheduled.

Pagano asked the applicants to address the events hours of operation; 2 A.M. could be too late for the adjacent owners.

The site visit has be preliminarily scheduled for the 19th of July, 2013.

Work session was closed at 2:15 p.m.

Gunnison Valley Properties, LLC; The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a site visit. They observed the site of a Preliminary/Final Plan; request for a year-round sand and gravel operation on 109-acres of a 220-acre parcel; 62-acres of which will be excavated. The operation will include the extraction, crushing, screening, washing and stockpiling of approximately 200,000 tons of sand and gravel per year. Asphalt and concrete batching is also proposed to be conducted at the facility. The property is located approximately ½ mile east of the City of Gunnison, south of Highway 50 to Tomichi Creek, legally described as a being located in the NE/4 SE/4 NW/4 Section 4 and the NE/4NE/4 Section 5, Township 49 North, Range 1 East, N.M.P.M., 43188 Highway 50.

Commissioner Wilcox recused himself.

No minutes were taken at the site visit.

Gunnison Valley Properties, LLC; the Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a work session, to review the Preliminary/Final Plan; request for a year-round sand and gravel operation on 109-acres of a 220-acre parcel; 62-acres of which will be excavated. The operation will include the extraction, crushing, screening, washing and stockpiling of approximately 200,000 tons of sand and gravel per year. Asphalt and concrete batching is also proposed to be conducted at the facility.

Commissioner Wilcox recused himself.

With a quorum present Chairman Kent Fulton opened the work session.

Applicant's representative Ben Langenfeld of Greg Lewicki and Associates was present for the discussion.

Site Visit Comments;

Rubingh- Nothing has changed with the site since the last site visit. He paid attention to where berms would be when considering the visual aspect; there are several areas where the berming would not be effectual. Slow moving trucks pulling out on to the highway could cause traffic safety concerns.

Seitz- Nothing much new from last site visit. He paid more attention to the view coming in from the west; the site is highly visible after the crack in the rock. If bermed it could change the visual of the whole valley floor. He was concerned with berm placement and visual site lines. He agreed with Rubingh, slow moving trucks pulling out on to the highway could cause traffic safety concerns.

Venard- No additional comments

Eskew – Agreed with her fellow commissioners about safety concerns, and was unsure how the berms would impact safety.

Fulton- Berms in some places will not be effective. Some of the adjacent owners will not benefit from the berms.

Rubingh asked about the temperature of the water because of the mining operation. He referred to a news article which said it could negatively impacting the fishery. Lewicki has specifically asked CPAW to provide comments; they has said they have not seen any negative impacts. Rubingh suggested asking Trout Unlimited for information on this issue. Lewicki agreed to contact Trout Unlimited. Eskew suggested contacting a biologist with Western State University. Lewicki agreed to try to contact Western State University.

Fulton asked if the discharge pump was on the bottom or on the surface; Lewicki said they discharge water at the surface.

Seitz asked if the dewatering sump pump runs 24 hours a day; Lewicki said only in the summer.

Eskew was concerned with how deep the pond would be and the biology, noting there are three different eco zones for reclamation.

Seitz noted his concern with traffic and slow trucks pulling out on the highway. He was very concerned the traffic study was not done at the peak traffic time- summer. There could be a real difference with the traffic flows between the April traffic and June, July, August and September traffic.

Fulton requested information in writing concerning the traffic study and why it was conducted in April, rather than during the peak tourist season. Lewicki will contact the traffic engineer who conducted the traffic study.

Rubingh reiterated Seitz's concern with slow truck traffic pulling out on to the highway. He was unsure why there would not be an acceleration and deceleration lane required.

Fulton was concerned with the dust from the haul road; Lewicki agreed to look into graveling areas which don't change very much. If watering does not work the next step is gravel.

Rubingh asked what happened to the moving berm concept: Lewicki said it was very difficult to actually do. The applicant and the engineer had concluded the newer location will be more beneficial; build it once and vegetate it.

Fulton asked what would be done to mitigate the visual impacts of the pit where the 10 ft. berm will not work. Lewicki explained there would be spots where the pit will be visible. He designed the 10 ft. berm to appear more natural, so it would not look out of place. It will follow the topography and remain at the 10 ft. height throughout. The berm will be planted with natural vegetation, not many trees.

The commissioners asked about the applicant working with adjacent business park owner (Signal Peak) to clean up the entrance to the valley. It was noted that it was not part of this application.

The commissioners summarized the major concerns:

The timing of the traffic study
The water quality of the fishery because of the mining operation
Berming for visual mitigation
The overall visual

Starkebaum noted the commission had received public comment from Ramon Reed.

The joint public hearing is scheduled for August 2, 2013.

Fulton adjourned the meeting at 4:25 P.M.

/S/ Beth Baker
Community Development Department Services Manager
Gunnison County Community Development Department